



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/650,412	08/29/2000	Raja Singh Tuli		8828
7590	04/27/2004		EXAMINER	
JAMES C. SCHELLER JR. BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025			KHOSRAVAN, JIMAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2141	8
DATE MAILED: 04/27/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/650,412	TULI, RAJA SINGH
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jiman Khosravan	2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 20-96 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 20-96 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED FINAL ACTION

Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of amendment submitted February 12, 2004.

Claims 1-19 are cancelled. Claims 20-96 are added.

a). Applicant's amendment; see pages 2-4, & 6, "In the Specification" & "In the Drawings," filed February 12, 2004, with respect to the "Drawings Objections" have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objections have been withdrawn.

b). Applicant's amendment; see page 5, "In the Abstract," filed February 12, 2004, with respect to the "Specification Objections," have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection to the abstract has been withdrawn.

c). Applicant's amendment; see page 28, "Remarks," filed February 12, 2004, with respect to the "Double Patenting," have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection has been withdrawn.

d). Applicant's amendment; see page 28, "Remarks," filed February 12, 2004, with respect to the "35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections," have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections have been withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on October 22, 2003 has been considered. Pages 3-20 of the IDS are included with this response.
3. The Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on February 24, 2004 has been partially considered. Pages 3-20 pertain to the references listed in the IDS filed October 22, 2003, as stated by applicant on page 1 of the IDS filed February 24, 2004, and therefore are not considered again. Only pages 21-23 of the IDS filed on February 24, 2004 have been considered and are included with this response as well.

Claim Rejections ~ 35 U.S.C. § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 20, 21, 32, 34, 44, 55, 62, 64, 68, 76, 83, 85, and 89, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakado et al. (US 6,014,133), and further in view of Magallanes et al. (US 5,925,103).

a). As per claims 20, 55, and 76, Yamakado teaches a method which is implemented on a server (data transmitter) to serve documents, the method comprising of rendering, at the server (Figure 14, item 48; Col. 4, lines 51-56) and for displaying on a screen attached to a remote device (Figure 14, item "Terminal"; Col. 4, lines 51-56), an image from the entire document (Col. 4, lines 51-56), the image being larger than a screen area on the remote device available for displaying the document (Col. 17, lines 46-48: The terminal is capable of scrolling the image, therefore the image must be larger than the screen area at the terminal), and sending from the server to the remote device, the image in a compressed format (Col. 5, lines 6-15). However, Yamakado does not explicitly teach receiving at the server, from the remote device, a request for the document, and wherein the document includes text and one or more links.

Magallanes teaches an Internet access device (remote device) where the server "listens" for incoming requests from the network access device to access Internet Websites, which include links and text (Col. 5, lines 28-35).

By allowing the system of Yamakado to serve requests of a terminal based on requests from the terminal for Internet sites, as in the system of Magallanes, Yamakado would be able to transmit Internet data to the receiver.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Magallanes in the system of Yamakado, because by implementing the specification as described above, the server actively listens for requests from the network access device, and further routes the request, either a WWW request, a IEMail request, or NetNews request, to the appropriate access module, wherein the correct protocol is routed back to the network access device based on the request. (Magallanes: Col. 5, lines 35-53).

b). As per claim 21, Yamakado-Magallanes teaches the claimed invention as described above, and further teaches wherein the document retrieved from the Internet by the server in response to the request for the document from the remote device (Magallanes: Figure 1; Col. 1, lines 53-67; Col. 21, lines 1-4).

c). As per claims 32, 62, and 83, Yamakado teaches a method which is implemented on a portable device (Figure 14, item 49 and “Terminal”), to access remote documents (data), the method comprising of receiving at the device, an image (Col. 4, lines 51-56), in a compressed format from the remote server (Col. 5, lines 6-15), the image being rendered at the remote server from the entire document, storing the image in the compressed format on the device (Col. 15, lines 18-35: When the terminal device receives the data, it is stored first, in the compressed format), and according to a user input to the device, selectively

displaying only a portion of the image on a screen attached to the device according to the image stored on the device (Col. 17, lines 46-48: The terminal is capable of scrolling the image. Only portions of the document that the user wishes to see are being displayed). However, Yamakado does not explicitly teach sending from the device to a remote server, a request for the document, and wherein the document has vector information including text.

Magallanes teaches an Internet access device (portable device) where the server (remote device) “listens” for incoming requests from the network access device to access Internet Websites, which include links and text (Col. 5, lines 28-35).

By allowing the system of Yamakado to serve requests of a terminal based on requests from the terminal for Internet sites, as in the system of Magallanes, Yamakado would be able to transmit Internet data to the receiver based on the terminal’s request.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Magallanes in the system of Yamakado, because by implementing the specification as described above, the server actively listens for requests from the network access device, and further routes the request, either a WWW request, a IEMail request, or NetNews request,

to the appropriate access module, wherein the correct protocol is routed back to the network access device based on the request. (Magallanes: Col. 5, lines 35-53).

d). As per claims 34, 64, and 85, Yamakado-Magallanes teaches the claimed invention as described above, and further teaches wherein the selectively displaying the portion of the image comprises scrolling the image on the screen at exclusive control of the device (Col. 17, lines 46-48: Scrolling occurs at the terminal).

e). As per claims 44, 68, and 89, Yamakado-Magallanes teaches the claimed invention as described above, and further teaches wherein retrieving at least a portion of an image of a previously requested document from a memory of the device (Yamakado: Col. 15, lines 18-35: When the terminal device receives the data, it is stored in the compressed format), the image of the previously requested document being previously received from the remote server and stored in memory of the device in compressed format (Yamakado: Col. 5, lines 6-15), and displaying at least a portion of the image of the previously requested document (Yamakado: Col. 17, lines 46-48: The terminal is capable of scrolling the image. Only portions of the document that the user wishes to see are being displayed).

6. Claims 33, 63, and 84, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakado-Magallanes, and further in view of Dorricott (US 6,125,209).

As per claims 33, 63, and 84, Yamakado-Magallanes teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Yamakado-Magallanes does not explicitly teach wherein the image comprises a plurality of sections, a first section of the plurality of sections that is not displayed on the device remains compressed on the device while one or more sections of the plurality of sections corresponding to the portion of the image displayed on the device are decompressed.

Dorricott teaches a device, which decompresses data images to be displayed on a screen, in scrollable format, and further teaches when all the data cannot fit onto the display; the device would decompress the remaining data during a smooth or rapid scroll (Abstract; Col. 1, lines 64-67; Col. 2, lines 1-9; Col. 7, lines 4-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dorricott in the system of Yamakado-Magallanes, because by decompressing only portions of the image which is currently displayed and not the entire image allows for faster transfer of data from device to display, and further decreasing waiting time for the user (Abstract; Col. 1, lines 41-48; Col. 2, lines 16-20).

7. Claims 22, 24, 35, 36, 38, 41-43, 56, 57, 65, 67, 77, 78, 86, and 88, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakado-Magallanes, and further in view of Gardell et al. (US 6,049,831).

a). As per claims 22, 56, and 77, Yamakado-Magallanes teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Yamakado-Magallanes does not explicitly teach receiving at the server from the remote device, a message to indicate a text input, the text input being received at the remote device relative to a location on a portion of the image displayed in the screen area, entering, at the server, the text input into the document at a location corresponding to the location on the portion of the image displayed in the screen area to render a refreshed portion of the image, and sending, from the server to the remote device, the refreshed portion of the image.

Gardell teaches a system to access a network, such as the Internet, wherein the system handles network information transfer between a network and the user device. The device transmits a notification that there has been a change at the remote device location such as inputted text (Figure 4: "Transmit State Change Notifications to Server"; Col. 5, lines 10-16 & 47-54), knowing the location of the

text input (Col. 4, lines 39-46), and sending the refreshed portion back to the remote device from the server (Col. 4, lines 8-17).

By allowing the documents of Yamakado-Magallanes to be inputted by text, as in the system of Gardell, the system of Yamakado-Magallanes would be able to have text entry making the system more user compatible.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gardell in the system of Yamakado-Magallanes, because by implementing the specification as described above, it provides a simple and elegant solution for providing Internet access which do not require purchases of new Internet-ready devices which are very expensive (Gardell: Col. 1, lines 31-40).

b). As per claims 24, 57, and 78, Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches receiving at the server from the remote device, a message to indicate a user selection of the location on the portion of the image displayed on the screen, and sending, from the server to the remote device, a message to accept keyboard entry in response to a determination that the document accepts text input at the location corresponding to the location on the portion of the image displayed on the screen (Gardell: Col. 3, lines 25-67; Col. 4, lines 1-54, Col. 5, lines 41-46, Col. 7, lines 14-25: Gardell

discloses if the user requests a page with a text input field, the host sends the user the translated page with the text input field to be filled in).

c). As per claims 35, 65, and 86, Yamakado-Magallanes teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Yamakado-Magallanes does not explicitly teach receiving at the device, a text input relative to a location on a portion of the image displayed on the screen, sending, from the device to the remote server, a message to indicate that the text input is to be entered into the document, receiving, at the device from the remote server, a refreshed portion of the image, the refreshed portion of the image being rendered at the remote server after entering the text input into the document at a location corresponding to the location on the portion the image displayed on the screen, and displaying the refreshed portion of the image on the screen.

Gardell teaches a system to access a network, such as the Internet, wherein the system handles network information transfer between a network and the user device. The device transmits a notification that there has been a change at the remote device location such as inputted text (Figure 4: "Transmit State Change Notifications to Server"; Col. 5, lines 10-16 & 47-54), knowing the location of the text input (Col. 4, lines 39-46), and sending the refreshed portion back to the remote device from the server (Col. 4, lines 8-17). Gardell further teaches if the

user requests a page with a text input field, the host sends the user the translated page with the text input field to be filled in (Col. 3, lines 25-67; Col. 4, lines 1-54; Col. 5, lines 10-16 & 41-46; Col. 7, lines 14-25).

By allowing the documents of Yamakado-Magallanes to be inputted by text, as in the system of Gardell, the system of Yamakado-Magallanes would be able to have text entry making the system more user compatible.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gardell in the system of Yamakado-Magallanes, because by implementing the specification as described above, it provides a simple and elegant solution for providing Internet access which do not require purchases of new Internet-ready devices which are very expensive (Gardell: Col. 1, lines 31-40).

d). As per claim 36, Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches wherein the text input comprises a string of text characters (Magallanes: Col. 8, lines 7-35: The user can interact and answer questions inputting text), and the message is sent from the device to the remote server in response to receiving, a command to send at the device (Magallanes: Col. 2, lines 15-25; Col. 10, lines 7-13: Commands can be entered through the network access device).

e). As per claim 38, Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches wherein the text input is a single text character, (Magallanes: Col. 8, lines 7-35: The user can interact and input text), and the message is sent from the device to the remote server in response to receiving, a single text character at the device (Magallanes: Col. 2, lines 15-25: Commands can be entered through the network access device).

f). As per claims 41, 67, and 88, Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell teaches the claimed invention as described above, and further teaches receiving text inputs at the device, storing text characters in a text file on the device according to the text inputs (Magallanes: Col. 8, lines 7-35: The user can interact and answer questions inputting text and is stored in the device), retrieving the text characters from the text file and sending, from the device to remote server, a message to enter the text characters into the document on the remote server at a location corresponding to a location on a portion of the image displayed on the screen (Gardell: Col. 4, lines 39-46).

g). As per claim 42, Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell teaches the claimed invention as described above, and further teaches wherein the text inputs are received while the device is not in communication with the remote server (Magallanes: Col. 1, lines 24-29).

h). As per claim 43, Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell teaches the claimed invention as described above, and further teaches wherein the text inputs comprise an electronic mail message and the document comprises a web page for sending the electronic mail message (Col. 5, lines 21-27).

8. Claims 23 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell, and further in view of Ouellette et al. (US 5,581,243).

As per claims 23, 39 Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches a keyboard as an input device attached to the remote device (Magallanes: Col. 2, lines 26-27). However, Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell does not explicitly teach a touch screen keyboard, wherein the message includes one or more matrix locations selected on the touch screen keyboard, and further determining at the server, one or more text characters from the one or more matrix locations to enter the text characters into the document.

Ouellette discloses a phantom keyboard that is formed on a touch sensitive display as an input tool for a computer. Ouellette further teaches the matrix

location of the touched screen is sent to the computer for processing (Col. 5, lines 4-41; Abstract)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ouellette in the system of Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell, because it is well known in the art that simulated keyboards of this type, where each key of the simulated keyboard is represented by a discretely defined area bounded by a frame (Ouellette: Col. 1, lines 44-50), a touch sensitive keyboard would enhance the system, easier to use, better versatility, and greater breathe of capabilities (Ouellette: Col. 2, lines 46-47).

9. Claims 25, 37, 40, 66, and 87, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell, and further in view of Clough et al. (US 5,379,057).

a). As per claim 25, Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches a keyboard as an input device attached to the remote device (Magallanes: Col. 2, lines 26-27). However, Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell does not explicitly teach the message to accept keyboard entry causes the remote device to display a keyboard layout on the remote device.

Clough discloses a portable computer with a touch screen (Col. 2, lines 53-63). Clough further teaches a simulated keyboard to appear on the display at appropriate times as data entry devices (Col. 3, lines 7-13). Clough also teaches the keyboard to be produced when input from a keyboard is required (Col. 20, lines 8-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Clough in the system of Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell, because typical hand-held devices have limited display screen sizes (Clough: Col. 1, lines 34-35).

b). As per claim 37, Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches a keyboard as an input device attached to the remote device (Magallanes: Col. 2, lines 26-27). However, Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell does not explicitly teach the text input is received at the device through one or more selections on a keyboard layout displayed on the screen, and the command to send causes the keyboard layout not being displayed on the screen.

Clough discloses a portable computer with a touch screen (Col. 2, lines 53-63). Clough further teaches a simulated keyboard to appear on the display at appropriate times as data entry devices (Col. 3, lines 7-13). Clough also teaches the

keyboard to be produced when input from a keyboard is required (Col. 20, lines 8-12). Clough further teaches the electronic touch screen keyboard on the screen of the device to automatically disappear once text has been entered and sent to the host (Col. 20, lines 8-14: The keyboard disappears until needed again).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Clough in the system of Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell, because typical hand-held devices have limited display screen sizes (Clough: Col. 1, lines 34-35).

c). As per claims 40, 66, and 87, Yamakado-Magallanes-Gardell-Clough teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches receiving at the device, a user selection of the location on the portion of the image displayed on the screen (Gardell: Col. 4, lines 39-46: Knowing the location of the text input), transmitting from the device to the remote server, a message to indicate the user selection (Gardell: Figure 4: "Transmit State Change Notifications to Server"; Col. 5, lines 10-16 & 47-54), receiving at the device from the remote server, a message to accept keyboard entry when the remote server determines that the document accepts text input at the location corresponding to the location on the portion of the image displayed on the screen (Gardell: Col. 3, lines 25-67; Col. 4, lines 1-54; Col. 5, lines 10-16 & 41-46; Col. 7, lines 14-25: Gardell further teaches if the user

requests a page with a text input field, the host sends the user the translated page with the text input field to be filled in), and displaying a keyboard layout on the screen in response to the message to accept keyboard entry (Clough: Col. 3, lines 7-13).

10. Claims 26-31, 45-51, 58-61, 69-74, 79-82, and 90-95, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakado-Magallanes, and further in view of MacLeod et al. (US 5,778,092).

a). As per claims 26, 45, 58, 69, 79, and 90, Yamakado-Magallanes teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches compressing the data to be transmitted to the remote device (Yamakado: Col. 5, lines 6-15). However, Yamakado-Magallanes does not explicitly teach wherein the image is in plurality of sections rendered from the document, wherein a first one of the plurality of sections is compressed in a first format, and a second one of the plurality of sections is compressed in a second format.

MacLeod teaches compressing documents comprising of color or gray-scale images. MacLeod further teaches multiple pluralities of sections are compressed in different formats (Col. 1, lines 45-67: a reduced-resolution foreground plane (text),

a reduced-resolution background plane (color/gray scale of graphics), and high-resolution binary selector plane (binary information for selecting a plane).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of MacLeod in the system of Yamakado-Magallanes, because by being able to compress different sections of a document by different compression techniques, each section can be compressed using the most optimal compression technique for that plane (MacLeod: Col. 1, lines 62-64).

b). As per claims 27, 46, 59, 70, 80, and 91, Yamakado-Magallanes-MacLeod teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches wherein the first format is lossless, and the second format is lossy (MacLeod: Col. 1, lines 10-22 & 64-67).

c). As per claim 28, 47, 71, and 92, Yamakado-Magallanes-MacLeod teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches wherein the plurality of sections is rendered from a text portion of the document, and the second one of the plurality of sections is rendered from a graphics portion of the document (MacLeod: Col. 1, lines 45-67: a reduced-resolution foreground plane (text), a reduced-resolution background plane (color/gray scale of graphics)).

d). As per claims 29, 48, 60, 72, 81, and 93, Yamakado-Magallanes-MacLeod teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches wherein the first one of the plurality of sections and the second one of the plurality of sections have different color depths (MacLeod: Col. 1, lines 45-67: a reduced-resolution foreground plane (text), a reduced-resolution background plane (color/gray scale of graphics)).

e). As per claims 30, 61, and 82, Yamakado-Magallanes-MacLeod teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches the image rendered from the document comprises a first layer in a reduced color depth, and one or more graphics portions with fine details to be overlaid over the first layer (MacLeod: Col. 1, lines 45-67: a reduced-resolution foreground plane (text), a reduced-resolution background plane (color/gray scale of graphics)).

f). As per claim 31, Yamakado-Magallanes-MacLeod teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches wherein the first layer is monochrome (MacLeod: Col. 1, lines 45-67: First plane is text, which is one color).

g). As per claims 49, 73, and 94, Yamakado-Magallanes-MacLeod teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches wherein the device decompresses sections of the image for display on the screen in a priority

according to color depth (MacLeod: Col. 14, lines 42-64: Text, then background, then binary information).

h). As per claims 50, 74, and 95, Yamakado-Magallanes-MacLeod teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches the image rendered from the document comprises a first layer in a reduced color depth, and one or more graphics portions with fine details to be overlaid over the first layer (MacLeod: Col. 1, lines 45-67: a reduced-resolution foreground plane (text), a reduced-resolution background plane (color/gray scale of graphics)), wherein the first layer is decompressed for display on the screen before the graphics portions are decompressed (MacLeod: Col. 14, lines 42-64: Text, then background, then binary information).

i). As per claim 51, Yamakado-Magallanes-MacLeod teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches wherein the first layer is monochrome (MacLeod: Col. 1, lines 45-67: First plane is text, which is one color).

11. Claims 52-54, 75, and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamakado-Magallanes, and further in view of Cronin, III et al. (US 6,182,127).

a). As per claims 52, 75, and 96, Yamakado-Magallanes teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Yamakado-Magallanes does not explicitly teach wherein displaying a plurality of icons with at least a portion of the image on the screen, and responsive to receiving a selection of one of the plurality of icons, transmitting from the device to the remote server a message to execute a command with respect to the document at the remote server.

Cronin III teaches a method for image files sent to a client workstation using graphical web browsers to display the view of an image from the server. Cronin III further discloses the user is allowed to click on any point in the image and the device sends a message to a host (a hyperlink, menu, or icon), wherein the host sends back a refreshed raster image (Col. 3, lines 18-61; Col. 8, lines 23-67; Col. 9, lines 1-48: Cronin III sends the page (scaled and regional) related to the hyperlink to the client).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cronin III in the system of Yamakado-Magallanes, because by implementing the specification as described above, it is possible to have a client which does not require proprietary workstation software, there will be better efficient use of the network and great speed of image

display, and it will minimize the computing resources required by the client device (Col. 1, lines 30-52).

b). As per claim 53, Yamakado-Magallanes-Cronin III teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches determining at the device one or more commands from the selection, wherein the message comprises the one or more commands (Col. 3, lines 18-61; Col. 8, lines 23-67; Col. 9, lines 1-48)

c). As per claim 54, Yamakado-Magallanes-Cronin III teaches the claimed invention as described above and further teaches wherein the message comprises information about the selection and the remote server determines the command from the information about the selection (Col. 3, lines 18-61; Col. 8, lines 23-67; Col. 9, lines 1-48: All commands go directly to the host, where they are executed and a refreshed raster image is sent back to the client).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 20-96 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jiman Khosravan whose telephone number is (703) 305-0704. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Communication via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [rupal.dharia@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Jiman Khosravan
Examiner
Art Unit 2141



April 21, 2004



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER